



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Elh

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,380	04/04/2001	Carl-Eric Ohlson	1166/61926-A	7391

23432 7590 07/07/2005

COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP
1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

HO, ALLEN C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2882

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/827,380

Applicant(s)

OHLSON, CARL-ERIC

Examiner

Allen C. Ho

Art Unit

2882

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Allen C. Ho

Allen C. Ho
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2882

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the prior art reference EP-A-0430934 cited in the specification provides support for a solid state detecting portion formed by plural solid state detecting elements. This argument is not persuasive. It should be recognized that mere reference to another application, patent, or publication is not an incorporation of anything therein into the application containing such reference for the purpose of the disclosure required by 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph. See MPEP § 608.01(p). The original specification disclosed a filmless system in which images are produced and stored electronically. There was no disclosure of a solid state detecting portion formed by plural solid state detecting elements, which is later introduced into the disclosure by claims 20, 23, 25, and 27.

The applicant argues that the declaration filed with this continuation reissue application is compliant with the patent rules at the time of filing of this reissue application. Specifically, the applicant argues that MPEP § 1414 section II, paragraph (D), and 37 C.F.R. § 1.175(e) were adopted after the filing date of this continuation reissue application. This argument is not persuasive. First, applicant is relying on the same error as the basis for this second reissue that was relied on as the basis for the first reissue. It should be recognized that this error cannot be said to be an error sufficient to provide a basis for the second reissue as it was unequivocally corrected by the grant of the first reissue patent. Second, although a new paragraph (e) was added to 37 C.F.R. 1.175 after the filing date of this continuation reissue application, the Office had always interpreted the rule to require any continuation reissue application, whose parent reissue application has not been abandoned, to include an oath or declaration identifying at least one error that is different from the error or errors corrected in the parent reissue application. See Federal Register, Vol. 69, No. 182, p. 56521, column 1, lines 31 - 41. The new paragraph (e) simply clarifies this interpretation. Similarly, this interpretation is also supported by MPEP § 1414, section II, paragraph (D).

For the above reasons, the rejections are being maintained.